

Memorandum of Meeting (Draft)

Date: 10/07/04

Date of Meeting: 9/30/04

Time: 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm

Location: Georgetown CHEER Center

Type: Georgetown Area Working Group Meeting #4

Attendance: See Attached

The following is a summary of the discussion at the Working Group Meeting:

- Bob Kramer called the meeting to order at 5:50. He initially focused his attention on the general public turnout. He indicated that an error had been made and that this evening's meeting was not a Public Workshop but a Working Group meeting. He further indicated that a Public Workshop would be held in Georgetown on November 9th. Mr. Kramer indicated that the public was welcome to stay, that no decisions would be made tonight and that this meeting was intended to give the Working Group their first view of potential preliminary alternatives. He asked that everyone please sign the sign-in sheet so that their names could be added to the mailing list if they were not already on the list. He then welcomed the Working Group back from their summer hiatus.
- Mr. Kramer asked the members to introduce themselves since there were some new members to the group and asked that they indicate any affiliations that they might have. Josh Thompson indicated that he was representing Eric Buehl. Following introductions, Mr. Kramer indicated that there would be a lot of details for the members to review this evening and then turned the floor over to Monroe Hite III, DelDOT's Project Manager.
- Mr. Hite directed his attention to the general public apologizing for the mix-up and welcoming the public to stay if they so chose. He reiterated the Workshop date and indicated that the Workshop would start at 4:00 and be held in the CHEER Center. He reinforced Mr. Kramer's request that those in attendance sign the sign-in sheets. Mr. Hite turned his attention to the Working Group, welcomed them, thanked them for their commitment, indicated that the Project Team had been busy over the summer and that there was a considerable amount of information to go over. He reviewed the material in their handout and indicated that, following a short presentation, the Working Group would break into smaller groups to review and comment on the various preliminary alternatives. He then turned the meeting back to Mr. Kramer.

- Mr. Kramer reviewed a list of recent meetings and briefings that had been held since the last meeting with the Working Group in May. He indicated that he expects the number of meetings to increase with the amount of detail that the group will see shortly. He indicated that, if there are community or business groups who would like a presentation, the Project Team is available to meet and discuss the project with them. He indicated that we are early in the process and now is the time to get meaningful input into the process.
- Mr. Kramer then addressed a number of potential misunderstandings that the Project Team has heard through the meetings and briefings that were reviewed previously. The first misconception is that “DelDOT has already made up its mind to go with On-alignment”. He indicated that the initial emphasis on On-alignment is based on extensive experience in working with the regulatory agencies, which are one of three groups (general public, Working Group, agencies) providing input to DelDOT through this process. The agencies will be involved in reviewing the environmental documentation for the project and the eventual permitting and that full and total consideration must be given to the On-alignment options before they will consider Off-alignment options. Both On-alignment and Off-alignment options will be fully considered. However, absolutely no decisions have been made by DelDOT.
- The second misunderstanding is that “DelDOT is trying to do this on the cheap.” Mr. Kramer indicated that this may be the result of some comments made earlier by the Project Team that On-alignment is cheaper than Off-alignment. While this may be true in some cases, it is not necessarily true in all cases. Cost is a factor but not the only factor and that all factors (traffic relief, improved safety, farmland and businesses impacts, etc.) will be weighed in making a decision. Mr. Kramer also indicated that the Project Team is just beginning to put together costs and is no where near knowing the costs of any of the options at this time.
- The third misunderstanding is that “DelDOT is intending to turn US 113 into a fully controlled access highway just like SR 1 from I-95 to Dover.” Mr. Kramer indicated that the effort, On-alignment, is to create a limited access roadway. Limited access does not mean no access, as is the case with a controlled access highway like SR 1. US 113 will have a different approach to access.
- The final misunderstanding deals with “the outcome (of this project) is already a done deal.” Mr. Kramer indicated that if there was an option that is without issues, then there would be a preferred choice. Since no “silver bullet” option exists, tough issues associated with all options are going to need to be addressed and trade-offs made. We are analyzing options on a daily basis. We are still in the early stages of a lengthy process. Therefore, a decision on a preferred option is a long way off. However, without broad-based community support, it will be difficult for the Secretary of Transportation, who has the final say, to select an alternative.
- Following a brief overview, Mr. Kramer introduced Bill Hellmann to introduce the details for this evenings meeting. Mr. Hellmann indicated that the Public Workshops in June had provided excellent comments to go along with the effort by the Working Groups. A lot of hard work over the summer had gone into developing and refining each of the options to be presented and to make them as

workable as possible. Mr. Hellmann indicated that the Working Group is moving from the concept level of 1000 foot wide yellow bands to preliminary alternatives with considerably more detail. The first step in evaluating these alternatives is to get your feedback, what you like and don't like. Your input is key as we continue to refine the alternatives.

- Mr. Hellmann then introduced Jeff Riegner who reviewed the Western Off-alignment options for the Georgetown Area.
- Merrill Moore asked where the Western options would cross Route 18. Mr. Riegner indicated just west of Delaware Tech.
- Ed Lester asked if Option 2 will act as a truck route around US 9, Mr. Riegner indicated that Option 2 would work the best to do that.
- Lit Dryden indicated that he was representing the Chamber of Commerce and that he did not see the benefit of any of the On-alignment options as they would be very harmful to the existing businesses along US 113 through Georgetown. It was indicated to Mr. Dryden that these were only part of the overall range of alternatives and that he would shortly be part of a smaller group to review each of the alternatives in detail.
- Mr. Riegner then introduced Joe Wutka who reviewed the Eastern Off-alignment options.
- Mr. Kramer asked Mr. Riegner to give a comparison of the length of the Western alternatives. Mr. Riegner indicated that the longest (F4) was approximately 7 miles and the shortest (E1) was about half that length.
- Mr. Wutka turned the meeting back to Mr. Riegner to review the On-alignment options for the Georgetown area.
- Mr. Riegner then turned the meeting back to Mr. Hite, who broke the Working Group into smaller groups to review the various preliminary alternatives with assistance from members of the Project Team.
- As a result of the effort by the Working Group members in their breakout session, the following comments were reported back to the entire Working Group:

General Comments-

West Off-alignment preferred to East Off-alignment. West addresses heaviest traffic movements at the US 113/404 intersection, east to south right turn and north to west left turn. Minimize impacts with the Off-alignment options by choosing the shorter of the options.

Eastern Off-alignment alternatives-

- New development not on map.
- Alternative "C" too tight.
- Like Alternative "C" because it is in tight.
- Alternative "C" too noisy.
- Alternative "B" too impactive on Agriculture.
- Local better access to business.
- Through traffic hurts businesses.
- Has to be a better way to accomplish project goal without the Off and On-alignment options shown.

- Not a lot of support.
- Few members saw benefit of bypassing Georgetown by East of Georgetown
- Prefer Alternative “C” because it is shorter and therefore less impactful to resources.

Option C

- Will impact new Christian High School.
- Provides acceptable access to Perdue plant.
- US 9 interchange will impact development. May need to redesign or move the interchange and provide noise abatement.
- Examine connection between Truck Route 9 and Arrow Safety Road extension.
- Provides no help with major east-west traffic.

Option B

- Need a different interchange at US 9 to provide adequate access to Perdue Plant.
- Consider relationship to planned development and annexation plans.

Western Off-alignment alternatives-

- 50% of eastbound SR 404 traffic is headed south, so an interchange with S.R. 404 is essential.
- Option D does a better job with truck traffic.
- Need to find out where traffic on US 9 is going to make interchange decisions. Maybe there shouldn't be any interchanges on US 9.
- Keep interchanges close to town with signs and access to businesses.
- Prefer farthest west option to allow for expansion of Georgetown to the new bypass.
- Overall, prefer a phased approach beginning with a west bypass from north to south of town with an interchange at SR 404. Study the effect these improvements will have and, when needed, provide an east Off-alignment connection from US 113 north of Georgetown to US 9. The result will be three quarters of a beltway around Georgetown, with the southeast link being created by Truck Route 9 and Park Avenue.
- Alternatives E1/E2 only possibilities.
- Alternative EF/2 better for movement around town.
- Still no dramatic support but some interest in Alternatives E1/E2 because of E/W Benefit.
- Preference for 'D' or some variation because it has an interchange with 404, considered essential.
- Preference to tying back into US 113 sooner rather than later, at US 9 or just south.
- Southern terminus of Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 acceptable.

On-alignment

- Look at future problems, try to solve them and not totally restructure traffic.
- For E/W benefit—on-alignment helps.
- Look at future problems on 113. Try to come up with a solution to solve those

- problems and not totally make 113 limited access.
- Prefer option 2 in the Wilson Road area with connector to east bypass.
 - No interest in options 1, 2, 3 or 4 in the Georgetown area – too many negative business and DelTech impacts and do not address east-west traffic.
 - On-alignment okay south of town below where bypass rejoins 113.
 - Need to realign Avenue of Honor and Pine Grove Roads to provide access to new high school, perhaps with an interchange at 113.
 - Redden Road to south of Wilson Road-generally okay with any of the alternatives.
 - An interchange or grade separation at Wilson Road is critical to keeping the Perdue trucks off the local streets in Georgetown.
 - South of Wilson Road to south of Arrow Safety Road-access between US 113 and SR 404 critical. Options 3 or 4, with access points close to SR 404 preferable to Options 1 or 2.
 - Connection between US 113 and SR 404 to accommodate east to south and north to west movements needs to be incorporated into any On-alignment option.
 - West side access road plus On-alignment alternative seen as most impactful since it combines both Off and On-alignment impacts.
 - Right-in/Right-out access connector south of 404 to DelTech campus desirable addition for any On-alignment option.
-
- Following the reports from the breakout groups, Mr. Kramer asked if there were any questions from the Working Group, in general. Hearing none, he summarized the views that he had heard including the development of an access road on the west side of existing 113, some support for a western bypass and the need for understanding the traffic flow in the area in regard to being able to make an informed decision on an alternative for Georgetown.
 - Terry Johnson asked if he had heard the idea of a beltway? It was indicated that at least one group had considered the possibility of a western bypass initially, possibly followed by a portion of an eastern bypass from 113 to US 9, providing $\frac{3}{4}$ of a bypass. It was also indicated that when you add in Truck Route 9 the City would, by default, have a full circumferential roadway.
 - Mr. Kramer indicated that the Project Team would make changes based on this evening's comments and come back to the group next month with those changes. In addition, how the information will be presented at the November Public Workshops will be a topic at the next Working Group meeting. We'll spend some time on what the Working Group wants to say to the public and how this is presented. The Project Team will make a presentation with options as to how to present the information to the public at the next Working Group meeting.
 - Mr. Kramer indicated that the next Working Group meeting will be October 18th at the CHEER Center. He also indicated that there will be a Public Workshop in the Georgetown Area on November 9th, again at the CHEER Center. Mr. Kramer asked that the Working Group members attend at least one hour of the Public Workshop, listen to the public and offer your insight.
 - There was a comment from the general public asking what mechanisms would be used to notify the public of the upcoming Public Workshop. Mr. Kramer and Mr.

Hite went through the list of items including posters, mailing lists, community newsletters, website, news briefings, public notice, etc. that would be used to hopefully get as large a turnout for the Workshop as possible.

- The Working Group meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.